



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

broken strings? Or can you even play it yourself, like the girl you sometimes tell me of, who had a harp too, in that lost city of Thebè, where my other grandsire lived,—tho' no one in all the castle will ever tell me a word about him, save you!

Andromache.

Peace! peace! O Grecian son of Pyrrhos: you will surely break my heart!"

WCL

WHY?

1 Why do a number of grammars give the feminine *quæ* to the interrogative pronoun *quis*?

It would seem that the analogy of the Greek, which only has two forms for its interrogative pronoun, would prevent one from making the mistake in Latin of giving a feminine to the substantive pronoun. This analogy is supported also by theoretical considerations. An interrogative substantive pronoun is one that asks as to the identity of an unknown individual. In the nature of the case, the sex of that individual is as doubtful as any other quality. Now in all cases where the sex is doubtful, it is a truism of linguistics that the masculine is used to include the feminine. In the early Latin this is carried so far that for the substantive pronoun, *quis* is used, even when the sex of the individual is known to be the feminine. Plantus shows a number of examples like *quis eam*? But this is an extension which is not to be too strictly observed. There are cases, no doubt, where it appears that the feminine is used as a substantive, but in all these cases strict construction would show that the sex of the individual is already known. For example: in a woman's institution the question who? would naturally imply a woman. So when I hear a knock at my office door, and see through the glass a woman's figure, I know when I say Who is it? that a woman is there. But such cases are so unusual as not to affect the rule which is, as I have stated, that the masculine includes the feminine. In the case of the adjective interrogative these considerations of course do not hold.

2 Why do some grammars persist in giving the form for the infinitive passive *amatus esse* instead of *amatum esse*?

This is a blunder that is pretty wide-spread, and one which I have never been able to comprehend. The same grammars are careful to state that the subject of an infinitive is in the accusative. They are careful to state that the predicate agrees with its subject in case, so that even if the infinitive form *amatus* is regarded as a predicate, it should be in the accusative to agree with the subject. No one of these grammarians would maintain that it was right to translate:—To be good is pleasant, by *bonus esse iuvat*; and yet they persist in this wrong form in despite of all the rules of grammar. The fact that after certain verbs of saying the *esse* serves to extend the meaning of the verb, and the predicate agrees through the *esse* with the subject of the verb, is no reason why that exceptional but natural usage should be extended to the paradigm. In every case where I have called the attention of a grammarian to this form, he has been prompt to admit that the form was wrong. It is hardly likely that the *amatus* form could be used for fear of confusion with the supine.

3 Why do our grammarians and teachers persist in giving the perfect participle instead of the supine as the fourth form in the principle parts?

I remember very well when this innovation was made. It came in about the time when we began to mark our vowels, and pay attention to other matters concerning the letter to the disregard of the more important matters of the spirit. The use of the supine as the fourth form of course always has been and is open to objection, but the use of the perfect participle is open to more. No fixed system can be employed, and, pedagogically, it is more difficult to learn in one case a form in *um* and in another a form in *us*, than it is always to learn a form in *um*. The matter of the difference between intransitive and transitive verbs, between impersonal and personal constructions, does not affect the supine. Of course, some one will perhaps say that there are a number of perfect participles in Latin and that there are very few supines; in fact, they may refer to Richter's article on the supine and give me the exact number that there are extant in the Latin literature. This seems to me to be a side issue. The supine form is a regular form, and it may be stated as a self-evident rule that, in the absence of specific information to the contrary, a regular form of a Latin word may always be assumed. The fact that we have so few supines is no reason to assume that if we had wider literature we would not have more. One recent grammar goes so far as to star the supine forms in the paradigm on the ground that they are non-existent. I must confess that this seems to me to be carrying pedantry to an extreme. The same grammarian that stars *laudatum* in the supine might as well have starred at least a dozen other forms in the paradigms which are just as non-existent as the supine. Who will give us authority for a large number of our perfect forms in the indicative and subjunctive? Who will fill out our future forms for us with references to actual cases? Who will give chapter and verse for many of our imperatives? And yet it is perfectly right to give them in the paradigm, just as it would be perfectly right, in case we were writing Latin, to use those forms in our composition. As I said before, to assume a regular form in the absence of testimony to the contrary is always admissible.

It is interesting, in this connection, to observe that the new Thesaurus of the Latin language that is now being prepared, gives the supine form as the fourth form in the principal parts and not the perfect participle. No one can object to progress when the progress is real, but when the progress is merely apparent progress and does not rest upon any solid foundation, it seems unfortunate that we should lay so much stress upon it.

4 Why do many teachers and all our editions of Cæsar lay so much stress on ability to turn direct into indirect discourse and the reverse?

One of the greatest difficulties in teaching the first book of Cæsar (which, by the way, sound pedagogy requires to be read first) is the large amount of indirect discourse which it contains. Conscientious teachers feel that this should not be slighted, and the result is discouraging not merely to the teachers but to the pupils.

But is not this conscientiousness misplaced? In the first place it should be remembered that the large use of this form of composition is characteristic of Cæsar beyond all other Latin authors. Livy and

Sallust are by comparison very chary in the use of it. Consequently, it appears that the pupils are being drilled in a trick which they will have very slight opportunity to employ thereafter, and which as a result they can only retain with as great an effort as was required to learn it.

The common rules of infinitive construction and of subjunctive in subordination or by attraction, they can learn in other passages, where the sense is simpler and more straightforward, and where even the most rigorous teacher would hardly require the reproduction of the original form. Why not then be content with this and make these speeches as little of a difficulty as possible? No evil result in the progress of the pupils is to be apprehended.

They may be simplified by being turned into the direct form by the teacher or editor, and in this form presented to the pupils, a method which seems to me to combine many advantages. Or the pupils may be required to translate without rigid analysis, and the teacher remain satisfied if the sense is approximately obtained. The rule for the infinitive is not difficult and is the important idiom; the tense relations of the subordinate clauses are sufficiently like the English to give the pupil little difficulty if he is let alone. Nor will he bother about pronominal changes, unasked.

Later if desired after the narrative of the four or five books is completed, the pupils may be drilled in *Oratio Obliqua*. But even then it can only be a linguistic exercise and adds nothing to the interest of the teacher, to the appreciation of style, to the actual command of the language.

Why not, then, defer this drill until the pupil is sufficiently grounded in the governing principles to make it a simple, logical exercise?

Gonzalez Lodge

Teachers' College, Columbia University

Tu similis flori appares,
Tam pulchra quam dulcisque pia,
Adspiciens te dolor me capit,
Et Animam triste afficit.

Mi'est, ascii in caput tuum
Essent ponendae mihi manus,
Obsecrans deum te servare
Et bonam et dulcemque piam.

In the above I send you a Latin rendering of Heine's familiar stanzas:

Du bist wie eine Blume
So hold und schön und rein;
Ich schau dich an, und Wehmut
Schleicht mir in's Herz hinein.

Mir ist, als ob ich die Hände
Auf's Haupt dir legen soll't,
Betend, dasz Gott dich erhalte
So rein so schön und hold.

Adolphe Dreyspring

Nov 15, 1902

887 Brook Ave, N Y

Prospectus for 1903-1904

To Whom it May Concern:

An editorial committee of Latin teachers from the High Schools in New York City will begin on Oct 1, 1903, the publication of the *fourth volume* of THE NEW YORK LATIN LEAFLET, a small four-page weekly sheet devoted primarily to the discussion of Latin or Greek topics touching the secondary field of Latin and Greek instruction. Latin will naturally continue to be the predominant feature. On the editorial committee and among the contributors are now representatives from seven of the New York High Schools, from The Normal College, The College of the City of New York, The Brooklyn Latin School, The Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Newark Academy, The Hotchkiss School, The Teachers' College, Packer Collegiate Institute, Adelphi College, The New York University, and Columbia University. Other local institutions will be represented as the work of organization goes on. This arrangement not only makes the editorial quotient small, but insures that the matter for publication will be of a reasonably high order; and, while an effort will be made to keep closely to the practical, no bar will be placed to contributions from any source bearing on the classics which the narrow limits of the publication will admit. The size of the little publication is indicated by this prospectus. To secure effectiveness, it will appear weekly during 25 weeks of the school year.

Owing to the extremely narrow constituency which such a technical publication as this naturally commands, the editorial committee has seen fit to give the paper a practical goal, such as the establishment of a High School College Entrance Scholarship Fund, to which every penny over and above the expenses of the publication will be devoted. It has been though wisest to place all the money secured, at the end of each year, in the hands of Trustees. Consequently, Mr Arthur S Somers, Ex-Commissioner of Education, Dr Nicholas Murray Butler of the College Entrance Examination Board and Mr Frederick D Mollenhauer of The Mollenhauer Sugar Refinery have kindly consented to take charge of this Fund in trust, and the money so far paid in is now in their hands.

All the labor involved, except the mechanical labor of printing, is a labor of love. To pay the expenses of publication, however, three columns will be open to advertising, and already assurances have been given for enough high class advertisements to vouchsafe for all expenses for another year in advance. Thus the financial part of the undertaking has been made as solid as a rock.* This leaves all money in the shape of subscriptions to the paper sacred to the Scholarship Fund. An attempt will be made to secure a permanent Fund of six thousand (\$6000) dollars, which will yield, say, three hundred (\$300) dollars, for an annual award. THE LATIN LEAFLET

*THE LEAFLET has lived long enough to demonstrate its practical value as an advertising medium, especially to publishers, and the increasing cheerfulness with which our advertisers renew their contracts from year to year is a matter of gratification to the Editorial Committee. THE LEAFLET is easily the best medium for reaching the classical teachers of the country, owing to its small size and large circulation. We cannot, of course, expect to attract publishers who have no books worth advertising or who desire to make their advertising conditional on the adoption of one or more of their publications.